arXiv:1703.09023v1 [cs.SI] 27 Mar 2017

Domination number and minimum dominating sets in pseudofractal scale-free web and Sierpiński graph

Liren Shan[a,b], Huan Li[a,b], Zhongzhi Zhang[a,b]

[a] *School of Computer Science, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China*
[b] *Shanghai Key Laboratory of Intelligent Information Processing, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China*

Abstract

The minimum dominating set (MDS) problem is a fundamental subject of theoretical computer science, and has found vast applications in different areas, including sensor networks, protein interaction networks, and structural controllability. However, the determination of the size of a MDS and the number of all MDSs in a general network is NP-hard, and it thus makes sense to seek particular graphs for which the MDS problem can be solved analytically. In this paper, we study the MDS problem in the pseudofractal scale-free web and the Sierpiński graph, which have the same number of vertices and edges. For both networks, we determine explicitly the domination number, as well as the number of distinct MDSs. We show that the pseudofractal scale-free web has a unique MDS, and its domination number is only half of that for the Sierpiński graph, which has many MDSs. We argue that the scale-free topology is responsible for the difference of the size and number of MDSs between the two studied graphs, which in turn indicates that power-law degree distribution plays an important role in the MDS problem and its applications in scale-free networks.

Keywords: Minimum dominating set, Domination number, Scale-free network, Sierpiński graph, Complex network

1. Introduction

A dominating set of a graph $\mathcal{G}$ with vertex set $\mathcal{V}$ is a subset $\mathcal{D}$ of $\mathcal{V}$, such that each vertex in $\mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{D}$ is adjacent to at least one vertex belonging to $\mathcal{D}$. We call $\mathcal{D}$ a minimum dominating set (MDS) if it has the smallest

Email address: zhangzz@fudan.edu.cn (Zhongzhi Zhang)

cardinality, and the cardinality of a MDS is called the domination number of graph $\mathcal{G}$. The MDS problem has numerous practical applications in different fields [1], particularly in networked systems, such as routing on ad hoc wireless networks [2, 3], multi-document summarization in sentence graphs [4], and controllability in protein interaction networks [5]. Recently, from the angle of MDS, structural controllability of complex networks has been addressed [6, 7], providing an alternative new viewpoint of the control problem for large-scale networks [8, 9].

Despite the vast applications, solving the MDS problem of a graph is a challenge, because finding a MDS of a graph is NP-hard [1]. Over the past years, the MDS problem has attracted considerable attention from theoretical computer science [10, 11, 12, 13, 14], discrete and combinatorial mathematics [15, 16, 17], as well as statistical physics [18], and continues to be an active object of research [19, 20]. Extensive empirical research [21] uncovered that most real networks exhibit the prominent scale-free behavior [22], with the degree of their vertices following a power-law distribution $P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$. Although an increasing number of studies have been focused on MDS problem, related works about MDS problem in scale-free networks are very rare [6, 23]. In particular, exact results for domination number and the number of minimum dominating sets in a scale-free network are still lacking.

Due to the ubiquity of scale-free phenomenon in realistic networks, unveiling the behavior of minimum dominating sets with respect to power-law degree distribution is important for better understanding the applications of MDS problem in real-life scale-free networks. On the other hand, determining the domination number and enumerating all minimum dominating sets in a generic network are formidable [1], it is thus of great interest to find specific scale-free networks for which the MDS problem can be exactly solved [24].

In this paper, we focus on the domination number and the number of minimum dominating sets in a scale-free network, called pseudofractal scale-free web [25, 26] and the Sierpiński graph with the same number of vertices and edges. For both networks, we determine the exact domination number and the number of all different minimum dominating sets. The domination number of the pseudofractal scale-free web is only half of that of the Sierpiński graph. In addition, in the pseudofractal scale-free web, there is a unique minimum dominating set, while in Sierpiński graph the number of all different minimum dominating sets grows exponentially with the number of vertices in the graph. We show the root of the difference of minimum dominating sets between studied networks rests with their architecture dis-



Figure 1: The first three generations of the scale-free network.

similarity, with the pseudofractal scale-free web being heterogeneous while the Sierpiński graph being homogeneous.

2. Domination number and minimum dominating sets in pseudofractal scale-free web

In this section, we determine the domination number in the pseudofractal scale-free web, and show that its minimum dominating set is unique.

2.1. Network construction and properties

The pseudofractal scale-free web [25, 26] considered here is constructed using an iterative approach. Let $\mathcal{G}_n$, $n \geq 1$, denote the n-generation network. Then the scale-free network is generated in the following way. When $n = 1$, $\mathcal{G}_1$ is a complete graph of 3 vertices. For $n > 1$, each subsequent generation is obtained from the current one by creating a new vertex linked to both endvertices of every existent edge. Figure 1 shows the networks for the first several generations. By construction, the number of edges in network $\mathcal{G}_n$ is $E_n = 3^{n+1}$.

The resultant network exhibits the prominent properties observed in various real-life systems. First, it is scale-free, with the degree distribution of its vertices obeying a power law form $P(k) \sim k^{1+\ln 3/\ln 2}$ [25]. In addition, it displays the small-world effect, with its average distance increasing logarithmically with the number of vertices [27] and the average clustering coefficient converging to a high constant $\frac{4}{5}$.

Another interesting property of the scale-free network is its self-similarity, which is also pervasive in realistic networks [28]. The initial three vertices of $\mathcal{G}_1$ have the largest degree, which we call hub vertices. For network $\mathcal{G}_n$, we denote its three hub vertices by A_n, B_n, and C_n, respectively. The self-similarity of the network can be seen from its alternative construction method [27, 29]. Given the nth generation network $\mathcal{G}_n$, $\mathcal{G}_{n+1}$ can be obtained



Figure 2: Another construction of the scale-free network.



Figure 3: Illustrations for the definitions of Θ_n^k, $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$, only showing the three hub vertices. (a), (b), (c) and (d) correspond to a dominating set belonging to Θ_n^0, Θ_n^1, Θ_n^2, and Θ_n^3, respectively. Every filled circle denotes a hub in the dominating set, while each empty circle represents a hub not in the dominating set.

by merging three replicas of $\mathcal{G}_n$ at their hub vertices, see Fig. 2. Let $\mathcal{G}_n^\theta$, $\theta = 1, 2, 3$, be three copies of $\mathcal{G}_n$, the hub vertices of which are represented by A_n^θ, B_n^θ, and C_n^θ, respectively. Then, $\mathcal{G}_{n+1}$ can be obtained by joining $\mathcal{G}_n^\theta$, with A_n^1 (resp. C_n^1, A_n^2) and B_n^3 (resp. B_n^2, C_n^3) being identified as the hub vertex A_{n+1} (resp. B_{n+1}, C_{n+1}) in $\mathcal{G}_{n+1}$.

Let N_n be the number of vertices in G_n. According to the second construction of the network, N_n obeys the relation $N_{n+1} = 3N_n - 3$, which together with the initial value $N_0 = 3$ yields $N_n = (3^n + 3)/2$.

2.2. Domination number and minimum dominating set

Let γ_n denote the domination number of network $\mathcal{G}_n$. In order to determine γ_n, we define some intermediate quantities. As shown above, there are three hub vertices in $\mathcal{G}_n$, then all dominating sets of $\mathcal{G}_n$ can be sorted into four classes: Ω_n^0, Ω_n^1, Ω_n^2, and Ω_n^3, where Ω_n^k ($k = 0, 1, 2, 3$) represents those dominating sets, each of which includes exactly k hub vertices. Let

Θ_n^k, $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$, be the subset of Ω_n^k, which has the smallest cardinality (number of vertices), denoted by γ_n^k. Figure 3 illustrates the definitions for Θ_n^k, $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$. By definition, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *The domination number of network $\mathcal{G}_n$, $n \geq 1$, is $\gamma_n = \min\{\gamma_n^0, \gamma_n^1, \gamma_n^2, \gamma_n^3\}$.*

After reducing the problem of determining γ_n to computing γ_n^k, $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$, we next evaluate γ_n^k by using the self-similar property of the network.

Lemma 2.2. *For two successive generation networks $\mathcal{G}_n$ and $\mathcal{G}_{n+1}$, $n \geq 1$,*

$$\gamma_{n+1}^0 = \min\{3\gamma_n^0, 2\gamma_n^0 + \gamma_n^1, 2\gamma_n^1 + \gamma_n^0, 3\gamma_n^1\}, \tag{1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{n+1}^1 = \min\{&2\gamma_n^1 + \gamma_n^0 - 1, 3\gamma_n^1 - 1, \gamma_n^0 + \gamma_n^1 + \gamma_n^2 - 1,\\ &\gamma_n^2 + 2\gamma_n^1 - 1, 2\gamma_n^2 + \gamma_n^0 - 1, 2\gamma_n^2 + \gamma_n^1 - 1\},\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{n+1}^2 = \min\{&2\gamma_n^1 + \gamma_n^2 - 2, \gamma_n^3 + 2\gamma_n^1 - 2, 2\gamma_n^2 + \gamma_n^1 - 2,\\ &\gamma_n^3 + \gamma_n^2 + \gamma_n^1 - 2, 3\gamma_n^2 - 2, \gamma_n^3 + 2\gamma_n^2 - 2\},\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

$$\gamma_{n+1}^3 = \min\{3\gamma_n^2 - 3, \gamma_n^3 + 2\gamma_n^2 - 3, 2\gamma_n^3 + \gamma_n^2 - 3, 3\gamma_n^3 - 3\}. \tag{4}$$

Proof. By definition, γ_{n+1}^k, $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$, is the cardinality of Θ_{n+1}^k. Below, we will show that the four sets Θ_{n+1}^k, $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$, constitute a complete set, since each one can be constructed iteratively from Θ_n^0, Θ_n^1, Θ_n^2, and Θ_n^3. Then, γ_{n+1}^k, $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$, can be obtained from γ_n^0, γ_n^1, γ_n^2, and γ_n^3.

We first consider Eq. (1), which can be proved graphically.

Note that $\mathcal{G}_{n+1}$ is composed of three copies of $\mathcal{G}_n$, $\mathcal{G}_n^\theta$ ($\theta = 1, 2, 3$). By definition, for any dominating set χ belonging to Θ_{n+1}^0, the three hub vertices of $\mathcal{G}_{n+1}$ are not in χ, which means that the corresponding six identified hub vertices of $\mathcal{G}_n^\theta$ do not belong to χ, see Fig. 2. Thus, we can construct χ from Θ_n^0, Θ_n^1, Θ_n^2, and Θ_n^3 by considering whether the other three hub vertices of $\mathcal{G}_n^\theta$, $\theta = 1, 2, 3$, are in χ or not. Figure 4 shows all possible configurations of dominating sets Ω_{n+1}^0 that contains Θ_{n+1}^0 as subsets. From Fig. 4, we obtain

$$\gamma_{n+1}^0 = \min\{3\gamma_n^0, 2\gamma_n^0 + \gamma_n^1, 2\gamma_n^1 + \gamma_n^0, 3\gamma_n^1\}.$$

For Eqs. (2), (3), and (4), they can be proved similarly. In Figs. 5, 6, and 7, we provide graphical representations of Eqs. (2), (3), and (4), respectively. □



Figure 4: Illustration of all possible configurations of dominating sets Ω^0_{n+1} of $\mathcal{G}_{n+1}$, which contain Θ^0_{n+1}. Only the hub vertices of $\mathcal{G}^\theta_n$, $\theta = 1, 2, 3$, are shown. Solid vertices are in the dominating sets, while open vertices are not.



Figure 5: Illustration of all possible configurations of dominating sets Ω^1_{n+1} of $\mathcal{G}_{n+1}$, which contain Θ^1_{n+1}.



Figure 6: Illustration of all possible configurations of dominating sets Ω^2_{n+1} of $\mathcal{G}_{n+1}$, which contain Θ^2_{n+1}.



Figure 7: Illustration of all possible configurations of dominating sets Ω^3_{n+1} of $\mathcal{G}_{n+1}$, which contain Θ^3_{n+1}.

Lemma 2.3. *For network* $\mathcal{G}_n$, $n \geq 3$, $\gamma^3_n \leq \gamma^2_n \leq \gamma^1_n \leq \gamma^0_n$.

Proof. We will prove this lemma by mathematical induction on n. For $n = 3$, we can obtain $\gamma^3_3 = 3$, $\gamma^2_3 = 4$, $\gamma^1_3 = 5$ and $\gamma^0_3 = 6$ by hand. Thus, the basis step holds immediately.

Assuming that the lemma hold for $n = t$, $t \geq 3$. Then, from Eq. (4), $\gamma^3_{t+1} = \min\{3\gamma^2_t - 3, \gamma^3_t + 2\gamma^2_t - 3, 2\gamma^3_t + \gamma^2_t - 3, 3\gamma^3_t - 3\}$. By induction hypothesis, we have

$$\gamma^3_{t+1} = 3\gamma^3_t - 3. \tag{5}$$

Analogously, we can obtain the following relations:

$$\gamma^2_{t+1} = \gamma^3_t + 2\gamma^2_t - 2, \tag{6}$$

$$\gamma^1_{t+1} = 2\gamma^2_t + \gamma^1_t - 1, \tag{7}$$

$$\gamma^0_{t+1} = 3\gamma^1_t. \tag{8}$$

By comparing the above Eqs. (5-8) and using the induction hypothesis $\gamma^3_t \leq \gamma^2_t \leq \gamma^1_t \leq \gamma^0_t$, we have $\gamma^3_{t+1} \leq \gamma^2_{t+1} \leq \gamma^1_{t+1} \leq \gamma^0_{t+1}$. Therefore, the lemma is true for $n = t + 1$.

This concludes the proof of the lemma. □

Theorem 2.4. *The domination number of network $\mathcal{G}_n$, $n \geq 3$, is*

$$\gamma_n = \frac{3^{n-2}+3}{2}. \tag{9}$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.1 and Eq. (5), we obtain

$$\gamma_{n+1} = \gamma_{n+1}^3 = 3\gamma_n^3 - 3 = 3\gamma_n - 3, \tag{10}$$

which, with the initial condition $\gamma_3 = 3$, is solved to yield the result. □

Theorem 2.4, especially Eq. (10), implies that any minimum dominating set of $\mathcal{G}_n$ includes the three hub vertices.

Lemma 2.5. *The smallest number of vertices in a dominating set of $\mathcal{G}_n$, $n \geq 3$, which contains exactly 2, 1, and 0 hub vertices, is*

$$\gamma_n^2 = \frac{3^{n-2}+1}{2} + 2^{n-2}, \tag{11}$$

$$\gamma_n^1 = \frac{3^{n-2}-1}{2} + 2^{n-1} \tag{12}$$

and

$$\gamma_n^0 = \frac{3^{n-2}-3}{2} + 3 \cdot 2^{n-2}, \tag{13}$$

respectively.

Proof. By Eqs. (9) and (10), we have $\gamma_n^3 = \gamma_n = \frac{3^{n-2}+3}{2}$. Considering Eq. (6), we obtain a recursive equation for γ_n^2 as:

$$\gamma_{n+1}^2 = 2\gamma_n^2 + \frac{3^{n-2}+3}{2} - 2, \tag{14}$$

which coupled with $\gamma_3^2 = 4$ is solved to give Eq. (11).

Analogously, we can prove Eqs. (12) and (13). □

Theorem 2.6. *For network $\mathcal{G}_n$, $n \geq 3$, there is a unique minimum dominating set.*

Proof. Equation (10) and Fig. 7 shows that for $n \geq 3$ any minimum dominating set of $\mathcal{G}_{n+1}$ is in fact the union of minimum dominating sets, Θ_n^3, of the three replicas of $\mathcal{G}_n$ (i.e. $\mathcal{G}_n^1$, $\mathcal{G}_n^2$, and $\mathcal{G}_n^3$) forming $\mathcal{G}_{n+1}$, with each pair of their identified hub vertices being counted only once. Thus, any minimum dominating set of $\mathcal{G}_{n+1}$ is determined by those of $\mathcal{G}_n^1$, $\mathcal{G}_n^2$, and $\mathcal{G}_n^3$. Since the minimum dominating set of $\mathcal{G}_3$ is unique, there is unique minimum dominating set for G_n when $n \geq 3$. Moreover, it is easy to see that the unique dominating set of $\mathcal{G}_n$, $n \geq 3$, is actually the set of all vertices of $\mathcal{G}_{n-2}$. □



Figure 8: The first three generations of the Sierpiński graph.

3. Domination number and minimum dominating sets in Sierpiński graph

In this section, we study the domination number and the number of minimum dominating sets in the Sierpiński graph, and compare the results with those of the above-studied scale-free network, aiming to uncover the effect of scale-free property on the domination number and the number minimum dominating sets.

3.1. Construction of Sierpiński graph

The Sierpinski graph is also built in an iterative way. Let $\mathcal{S}_n$, $n \geq 1$, denote the n-generation graph. Then the Sierpiński graph is created as follows. When $n = 1$, $\mathcal{S}_1$ is an equilateral triangle containing three vertices and three edges. For $n = 2$, perform a bisection of the sides of $\mathcal{S}_1$ forming four small replicas of the original equilateral triangle, and remove the central downward pointing triangle to get $\mathcal{S}_2$. For $n > 2$, $\mathcal{S}_n$ is obtained from $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}$ by performing the bisecting and removing operations for each triangle in $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}$. Figure 8 shows theSierpiński graphs for $n = 1, 2, 3$.

It is easy to verify that both the number of vertices and the number of edges in the Sierpiński $\mathcal{S}_n$ graph are identical to those for the scale-free network $\mathcal{G}_n$, which are $N_n = (3^n + 3)/2$ and $E_n = 3^{n+1}$, respectively.

Different from $\mathcal{G}_n$, the Sierpiński graph is homogeneous, since the degree of vertices in $\mathcal{S}_n$ is equal to 3, excluding the topmost vertex A_n, leftmost vertex B_n and the rightmost vertex C_n, the degree of which is 2. We call these three vertices with degree 2 as outmost vertices.

The Sierpiński graph is also self-similar, which suggests another construction method of the graph. Given the nth generation graph $\mathcal{S}_n$, the $(n+1)$th generation graph $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}$ can be obtained by joining three replicas of



Figure 9: Alternative construction of the Sierpiński graph.

$\mathcal{S}_n$ at their outmost vertices, see Fig. 9. Let $\mathcal{S}_n^\theta$, $\theta = 1, 2, 3$, be three copies of $\mathcal{S}_n$, the outmost vertices of which are represented by A_n^θ, B_n^θ, and C_n^θ, respectively. Then, $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}$ can be obtained by joining $\mathcal{S}_n^\theta$, with A_n^1, B_n^2, and C_n^3 being the outmost vertices A_{n+1}, B_{n+1}, and C_{n+1} of $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}$.

3.2. Domination number

In the case without confusion, for the Sierpiński graph $\mathcal{S}_n$ we employ the same notation as those for $\mathcal{G}_n$ studied in the preceding section. Let γ_n be the domination number of $\mathcal{S}_n$. Note that all dominating sets of $\mathcal{S}_n$ can be classified into four types: Ω_n^0, Ω_n^1, Ω_n^2, and Ω_n^3, where Ω_n^k ($k = 0, 1, 2, 3$) denotes those dominating sets, each including exactly k outmost vertices. Let Θ_n^k, $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$, be the subsets of Ω_n^k, each of which has the smallest cardinality, denoted by γ_n^k.

Lemma 3.1. *The domination number of the Sierpiński graph $\mathcal{S}_n$, $n \geq 1$, is* $\gamma_n = \min\{\gamma_n^0, \gamma_n^1, \gamma_n^2, \gamma_n^3\}$.

Thus, in order to determine γ_n for $\mathcal{S}_n$, we can alternatively evaluate γ_n^k, $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$, which can be solved by using the self-similar structure of the Sierpinski graph.

To determine γ_n^k, $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$, we introduce some more quantities assisting the calculation. We use $\mathcal{S}_n^k$ to denote a subgraph of the Sierpiński graph $\mathcal{S}_n$, which is obtained from $\mathcal{S}_n$ by removing k, $k = 1, 2, 3$, outmost vertices and the edges incident to them. Let ϕ_n^i, $i = 0, 1, 2$ be the smallest number of vertices in a dominating set of $\mathcal{S}_n^1$ containing i outmost vertices but excluding either of the two neighbors of the removed outmost vertex; let ξ_n^j, $j = 0, 1$, be the smallest number of vertices in a dominating set of $\mathcal{S}_n^2$ including j outmost vertex but excluding any neighbor of the two removed outmost vertices; and let η_n denote the smallest number of vertices

in a dominating set of $\mathcal{S}_n^3$, which does not include the neighbors of the three removed outmost vertices.

According to the self-similar property of the Sierpiński graph, we can establish some relations between the quantities defined above.

Lemma 3.2. *For any integer $n \geq 3$, the following relations hold.*

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{n+1}^0 = \min\{&\gamma_n^0+\phi_n^0+\xi_n^0, 3\phi_n^0, 2\gamma_n^0+\xi_n^0, \gamma_n^0+2\phi_n^0, 2\gamma_n^0+\phi_n^0, 3\gamma_n^0,\\ &2\gamma_n^1+\xi_n^0-1, \gamma_n^0+2\phi_n^1-1, \gamma_n^1+\phi_n^1+\phi_n^0-1, 2\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^0-1, \gamma_n^1+\gamma_n^0+\phi_n^1-1,\\ &2\gamma_n^1+\gamma_n^0-1, \gamma_n^2+\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^1-2, \gamma_n^2+2\gamma_n^1-2, 3\gamma_n^2-3\},\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{n+1}^1 = \min\{&\gamma_n^0+\phi_n^1+\xi_n^0, \gamma_n^1+\phi_n^0+\xi_n^0, \gamma_n^0+\phi_n^0+\xi_n^1, \phi_n^1+2\phi_n^0, 2\gamma_n^0+\xi_n^1, \gamma_n^0+\phi_n^1+\phi_n^0,\\ &\gamma_n^1+\gamma_n^0+\xi_n^0, \gamma_n^1+2\phi_n^0, 2\gamma_n^0+\phi_n^1, \gamma_n^1+\gamma_n^0+\phi_n^0, \gamma_n^1+2\gamma_n^0,\\ &\gamma_n^2+\gamma_n^1+\xi_n^0-1, \gamma_n^0+\phi_n^2+\phi_n^1-1, \gamma_n^1+\phi_n^2+\phi_n^0-1, \gamma_n^2+\phi_n^1+\phi_n^0-1,\\ &\gamma_n^1+\gamma_n^0+\phi_n^2-1, \gamma_n^2+\gamma_n^0+\phi_n^1-1, \gamma_n^2+\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^0-1, \gamma_n^2+\gamma_n^1+\gamma_n^0-1,\\ &2\gamma_n^1+\xi_n^1-1, \gamma_n^1+2\phi_n^1-1, 2\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^1-1, 3\gamma_n^1-1, \gamma_n^3+\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^1-2,\\ &\gamma_n^3+2\gamma_n^1-2, \gamma_n^2+\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^2-2, 2\gamma_n^2+\phi_n^1-2, 2\gamma_n^2+\gamma_n^1-2, \gamma_n^3+2\gamma_n^2-3\},\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{n+1}^2 = \min\{&\gamma_n^0+\phi_n^1+\xi_n^1, \gamma_n^1+\phi_n^0+\xi_n^1, \gamma_n^1+\phi_n^1+\xi_n^0, 2\phi_n^1+\phi_n^0, 2\gamma_n^1+\xi_n^0, \gamma_n^1+\gamma_n^0+\xi_n^1,\\ &\gamma_n^0+2\phi_n^1, \gamma_n^1+\phi_n^1+\phi_n^0, 2\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^0, \gamma_n^1+\gamma_n^0+\phi_n^1, 2\gamma_n^1+\gamma_n^0,\\ &\gamma_n^0+2\phi_n^2-1, \gamma_n^2+\phi_n^2+\phi_n^0-1, 2\gamma_n^2+\xi_n^0-1, \gamma_n^2+\gamma_n^0+\phi_n^2-1, 2\gamma_n^2+\phi_n^0-1,\\ &2\gamma_n^2+\gamma_n^0-1, \gamma_n^1+\phi_n^2+\phi_n^1-1, \gamma_n^2+\gamma_n^1+\xi_n^1-1, \gamma_n^2+2\phi_n^1-1,\\ &\gamma_n^2+\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^1-1, 2\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^2-1, \gamma_n^2+2\gamma_n^1-1, \gamma_n^3+\gamma_n^2+\phi_n^1-2,\\ &\gamma_n^3+\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^2-2, \gamma_n^3+\gamma_n^2+\gamma_n^1-2, 2\gamma_n^2+\phi_n^2-2, 3\gamma_n^2-2, 2\gamma_n^3+\gamma_n^2-3\},\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{n+1}^3 = \min\{&\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^1+\xi_n^1, 3\phi_n^1, 2\gamma_n^1+\xi_n^1, \gamma_n^1+2\phi_n^1, 2\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^1, 3\gamma_n^1,\\ &2\gamma_n^2+\xi_n^1-1, \gamma_n^1+2\phi_n^2-1, \gamma_n^2+\phi_n^2+\phi_n^1-1, 2\gamma_n^2+\phi_n^1-1, \gamma_n^2+\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^2-1,\\ &2\gamma_n^2+\gamma_n^1-1, \gamma_n^3+\gamma_n^2+\phi_n^2-2, \gamma_n^3+2\gamma_n^2-2, 3\gamma_n^3-3\},\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{n+1}^0 = \min\{&\gamma_n^0+2\xi_n^0, 2\phi_n^0+\xi_n^0, \gamma_n^0+\phi_n^0+\eta_n, 2\gamma_n^0+\eta_n, \gamma_n^0+\phi_n^0+\xi_n^0,\\ &3\phi_n^0, 2\gamma_n^0+\xi_n^0, \gamma_n^0+2\phi_n^0, 2\gamma_n^0+\phi_n^0, \gamma_n^1+\phi_n^1+\xi_n^0-1, 2\phi_n^1+\phi_n^0-1,\\ &\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^0+\xi_n^1-1, \gamma_n^0+\phi_n^1+\xi_n^1-1, \gamma_n^0+2\phi_n^1-1, \gamma_n^1+\gamma_n^0+\xi_n^1-1,\\ &\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^1+\phi_n^0-1, \gamma_n^1+\gamma_n^0+\phi_n^1-1, 2\gamma_n^1+\eta_n-1, 2\phi_n^1+\phi_n^0-1,\\ &\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^1+\xi_n^0-1, 2\gamma_n^1+\xi_n^0-1, \gamma_n^1+\pi_n^1+\phi_n^0-1, 2\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^0-1,\\ &\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^2+\phi_n^1-2, 2\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^2-2, \gamma_n^2+\gamma_n^1+\xi_n^1-2, \gamma_n^2+2\phi_n^1-2,\\ &\gamma_n^2+\gamma_n^1+\phi_n^1-2, 2\gamma_n^2+\phi_n^2-3\},\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

$$\phi^1_{n+1} = \min\{\gamma^1_n + 2\xi^0_n, 2\phi^0_n + \xi^1_n, \gamma^0_n + \xi^1_n + \xi^0_n, \phi^1_n + \phi^0_n + \xi^0_n, \gamma^1_n + \phi^0_n + \eta_n, \gamma^0_n + \phi^1_n + \eta_n,$$
$$\phi^1_n + \phi^0_n + \xi^0_n, \phi^1_n + 2\phi^0_n, \gamma^0_n + \phi^1_n + \xi^0_n, \gamma^1_n + \phi^0_n + \xi^0_n, \gamma^0_n + \phi^1_n + \phi^0_n, \gamma^0_n + \gamma^1_n + \xi^0_n,$$
$$\gamma^1_n + 2\phi^0_n, \gamma^1_n + \gamma^0_n + \phi^0_n, \gamma^2_n + \phi^1_n + \xi^0_n - 1, \gamma^0_n + \phi^2_n + \xi^1_n - 1, \gamma^2_n + \phi^0_n + \xi^1_n - 1,$$
$$\phi^2_n + \phi^1_n + \phi^0_n - 1, \gamma^0_n + \phi^2_n + \phi^1_n - 1, \gamma^2_n + \phi^1_n + \phi^0 - 1, \gamma^2_n + \gamma^0_n + \xi^1_n - 1,$$
$$\gamma^2_n + \gamma^0_n + \phi^1_n - 1, \gamma^1_n + \phi^1_n + \xi^1_n - 1, 3\phi^1_n - 1, \gamma^1_n + 2\phi^1_n - 1, 2\gamma^1_n + \xi^1_n - 1, 2\gamma^1_n + \phi^1_n - 1,$$
$$\gamma^2_n + \gamma^1_n + \eta_n - 1, \gamma^1_n + \phi^2_n + \xi^0_n - 1, \gamma^2_n + \gamma^1_n + \xi^0_n - 1, \gamma^1_n + \phi^2_n + \phi^0_n - 1,$$
$$\gamma^2_n + \gamma^1_n + \phi^0_n - 1, \gamma^2_n + \phi^2_n + \phi^1_n - 2, \gamma^1_n + 2\phi^2_n - 2, \gamma^2_n + \gamma^1_n + \phi^2_n - 2, 2\gamma^2_n + \xi^1_n - 2,$$
$$2\gamma^2_n + \phi^1_n - 2, \gamma^3_n + \gamma^1_n + \xi^1_n - 2, \gamma^3_n + 2\phi^1_n - 2, \gamma^3_n + \gamma^1_n + \phi^1_n - 2, \gamma^3_n + \gamma^2_n + \phi^2_n - 3\}, \tag{20}$$

$$\phi^2_{n+1} = \min\{\phi^1_n + \phi^0_n + \xi^1_n, \gamma^1_n + \phi^1_n + \eta_n, 2\phi^1_n + \xi^0_n, \gamma^1_n + \xi^1_n + \xi^0_n, 2\phi^1_n + \phi^0_n, \gamma^1_n + \phi^1_n + \xi^0_n,$$
$$2\gamma^1_n + \xi^0_n, \gamma^1_n + \phi^1_n + \phi^0_n, 2\gamma^1_n + \phi^0_n, 2\phi^2_n + \phi^0_n - 1, 2\gamma^2_n + \eta_n - 1, \gamma^2_n + \phi^2_n + \xi^0_n - 1,$$
$$\gamma^2_n + \phi^2_n + \phi^0_n - 1, 2\gamma^2_n + \xi^0_n - 1, 2\gamma^2_n + \phi^0_n - 1, \gamma^1_n + \phi^2_n + \xi^1_n - 1, \gamma^2_n + \phi^1_n + \xi^1_n - 1,$$
$$\phi^2_n + 2\phi^1_n - 1, \gamma^2_n + \gamma^1_n + \xi^1_n - 1, \gamma^2_n + 2\phi^1_n - 1, \gamma^1_n + \phi^2_n + \phi^1_n - 1, \gamma^2_n + \gamma^1_n + \phi^1_n - 1,$$
$$\gamma^2_n + 2\phi^2_n - 2, 2\gamma^2_n + \phi^2_n - 2, \gamma^3_n + \gamma^2_n + \xi^1_n - 2, \gamma^3_n + \phi^2_n + \phi^1_n - 2, \gamma^3_n + \gamma^2_n + \phi^1_n - 2,$$
$$2\gamma^3_n + \phi^2_n - 3\}, \tag{21}$$

$$\xi^0_{n+1} = \min\{\gamma^0_n + \xi^0_n + \eta_n, \phi^0_n + 2\xi^0_n, 2\phi^0_n + \eta_n, \gamma^0_n + \phi^0_n + \eta_n, 2\phi^0_n + \xi^0_n, \gamma^0_n + 2\xi^0_n, 3\phi^0_n,$$
$$\gamma^0_n + \phi^0_n + \xi^0_n, \gamma^0_n + 2\phi^0_n, \gamma^0_n + 2\xi^1_n - 1, 2\phi^1_n + \xi^0_n - 1, \phi^1_n + \phi^0_n + \xi^1_n - 1, 2\phi^1_n + \phi^0_n - 1,$$
$$\gamma^0_n + \phi^1_n + \xi^1_n - 1, \gamma^0_n + 2\phi^1_n - 1, \gamma^1_n + \phi^1_n + \eta_n - 1, \gamma^1_n + \xi^1_n + \xi^0_n - 1, \gamma^1_n + \phi^1_n + \xi^0_n - 1,$$
$$\gamma^1_n + \phi^0_n + \xi^1_n - 1, \gamma^1_n + \xi^1_n + \xi^0_n - 1, \gamma^2_n + \phi^1_n + \xi^1_n - 2, \gamma^2_n + 2\phi^1_n - 2,$$
$$\gamma^1_n + \phi^2_n + \xi^1_n - 2, \gamma^1_n + \phi^2_n + \phi^1_n - 2, \phi^2_n + 2\phi^1_n - 2, \gamma^2_n + 2\phi^2_n - 3\}, \tag{22}$$

$$\xi^1_{n+1} = \min\{\gamma^1_n + \xi^0_n + \eta_n, \phi^0_n + \xi^1_n + \xi^0_n, \phi^1_n + \phi^0_n + \eta_n, \phi^1_n + 2\xi^0_n, \phi^1_n + \phi^0_n + \xi^0_n, \gamma^1_n + 2\xi^0_n,$$
$$\phi^1_n + 2\phi^0_n, \gamma^1_n + \phi^0_n + \xi^0_n, \gamma^1_n + 2\phi^0_n, \gamma^1_n + 2\xi^1_n - 1, 2\phi^1_n + \xi^1_n - 1, 3\phi^1_n - 1,$$
$$\gamma^1_n + \phi^1_n + \xi^1_n - 1, \gamma^1_n + 2\phi^1_n - 1, \phi^2_n + \phi^0_n + \xi^1_n - 1, \gamma^2_n + \phi^1_n + \eta_n - 1, \gamma^2_n + \xi^1_n + \xi^0_n - 1,$$
$$\gamma^2_n + \phi^1_n + \xi^0_n - 1, \gamma^2_n + \phi^1_n + \xi^0_n - 1, \phi^2_n + \phi^1_n + \phi^0_n - 1, \gamma^2_n + \phi^0_n + \xi^1_n - 1,$$
$$\gamma^2_n + \phi^1_n + \phi^0_n - 1, \gamma^3_n + \phi^1_n + \xi^1_n - 2, \gamma^3_n + 2\phi^1_n - 2, \gamma^2_n + \phi^2_n + \xi^1_n - 2,$$
$$2\phi^2_n + \phi^1_n - 2, \gamma^2_n + \phi^2_n + \phi^1_n - 2, \gamma^3_n + 2\phi^2_n - 3\}, \tag{23}$$

$$\eta_{n+1} = \min\{\phi^0_n + \xi^0_n + \eta_n, 3\xi^0_n, \phi^0_n + 2\xi^0_n, 2\phi^0_n + \eta_n, 2\phi^0_n + \xi^0_n, 3\phi^0_n, \phi^0_n + 2\xi^1_n - 1, 2\phi^1_n + \eta_n - 1,$$
$$\phi^1_n + \xi^1_n + \xi^0_n - 1, 2\phi^1_n + \xi^0_n - 1, \phi^1_n + \phi^0_n + \xi^1_n - 1, 2\phi^1_n + \phi^0_n - 1, \phi^2_n + \phi^1_n + \xi^1_n - 2,$$
$$\phi^2_n + 2\phi^1_n - 2, 3\phi^2_n - 3\}. \tag{24}$$

Proof. This lemma can be proved graphically. Figs. 10-19 illustrate the graphical representations from Eq. (15) to Eq. (24). □



Figure 10: Illustration of all possible configurations of dominating sets Ω_{n+1}^0 of $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}$, which contain Θ_{n+1}^0. Only the outmost vertices of $\mathcal{S}_n^\theta$, $\theta = 1, 2, 3$, are shown. Solid vertices are in the dominating sets, open vertices are not, while cross vertices denote those removed outmost vertices in $\mathcal{S}_n^\theta$.

Lemma 3.3. *For arbitrary $n \geq 3$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_n^1 &= \gamma_n^0 + 1\,,\\
\gamma_n^2 &= \gamma_n^0 + 2\,,\\
\gamma_n^3 &= \gamma_n^0 + 2\,,\\
\phi_n^0 &= \gamma_n^0\,,\\
\phi_n^1 &= \gamma_n^0 + 1\,,\\
\phi_n^2 &= \gamma_n^0 + 1\,,\\
\xi_n^0 &= \gamma_n^0\,,\\
\xi_n^1 &= \gamma_n^0 + 1\,,\\
\eta_n &= \gamma_n^0\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We prove this lemma by induction.

For $n = 3$, it is easy to obtain by hand that $\gamma_3^0 = 3$, $\gamma_3^1 = 4$, $\gamma_3^2 = 5$, $\gamma_3^3 = 5$, $\phi_3^0 = 3$, $\phi_3^1 = 4$, $\phi_3^2 = 4$, $\xi_3^0 = 3$, $\xi_3^1 = 4$, and $\eta_3 = 3$. Thus, the result is true for $n = 3$.

Let us assume that the lemma holds for $n = t$. For $n = t+1$, by induction assumption and lemma 3.2, it is not difficult to check that the result is true for $n = t + 1$. $\square$



Figure 11: Illustration of all possible configurations of dominating sets Ω_{n+1}^1 of $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}$, which contain Θ_{n+1}^1.



Figure 12: Illustration of all possible configurations of dominating sets Ω_{n+1}^2 of $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}$, which contain Θ_{n+1}^2.



Figure 13: Illustration of all possible configurations of dominating sets Ω_{n+1}^3 of $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}$, which contain Θ_{n+1}^3.


(a) :
$\gamma_n^0 + 2\xi_n^0$
$2\phi_n^0 + \xi_n^0$
$\gamma_n^0 + \phi_n^0 + \eta_n$
$2\gamma_n^0 + \eta_n$
$\gamma_n^0 + \phi_n^0 + \xi_n^0$
$3\phi_n^0$
$2\gamma_n^0 + \xi_n^0$
$\gamma_n^0 + 2\phi_n^0$
$2\gamma_n^0 + \phi_n^0$
(b) :
$\gamma_n^1 + \phi_n^1 + \xi_n^0 - 1$
$2\phi_n^1 + \phi_n^0 - 1$
$\gamma_n^1 + \phi_n^0 + \xi_n^1 - 1$
$\gamma_n^0 + \xi_n^1$
$\gamma_n^0 + 2\phi_n^1 - 1$
$\gamma_n^1 + \gamma_n^0 + \xi_n^1 - 1$
$\gamma_n^1 + \phi_n^1 + \phi_n^0 - 1$
$\gamma_n^1 + \gamma_n^0 + \phi_n^1 - 1$
(c) :
$2\gamma_n^1 + \eta_n - 1$
$2\phi_n^1 + \phi_n^0 - 1$
$\gamma_n^1 + \phi_n^1 + \xi_n^0 - 1$
$2\gamma_n^1 + \xi_n^0 - 1$
$\gamma_n^1 + \phi_n^1 + \phi_n^0 - 1$
$2\gamma_n^1 + \phi_n^0 - 1$
(d) :
$\gamma_n^1 + \phi_n^2 + \phi_n^1 - 2$
$2\gamma_n^1 + \phi_n^2 - 2$
(e) :
$\gamma_n^2 + \gamma_n^1 + \xi_n^1 - 2$
$\gamma_n^2 + 2\phi_n^1 - 2$
$\gamma_n^2 + \gamma_n^1 + \phi_n^1 - 2$
(f) :
$2\gamma_n^2 + \phi_n^2 - 3$

Figure 14: Illustration of all possible configurations of dominating sets of $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}^1$, which contain those sets with minimum cardinality ϕ_{n+1}^0.



Figure 15: Illustration of all possible configurations of dominating sets of $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}^1$, which contain those sets with minimum cardinality ϕ_{n+1}^1.



Figure 16: Illustration of all possible configurations of dominating sets of $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}^1$, which contain those sets with minimum cardinality ϕ_{n+1}^2.


(a) :
$\gamma_n^0 + \xi_n^0 + \eta_n$
$\phi_n^0 + 2\xi_n^0$
$2\phi_n^0 + \eta_n$
$\phi_n^0 + 2\xi_n^0$
$2\phi_n^0 + \xi_n^0$
$\gamma_n^0 + 2\xi_n^0$
$3\phi_n^0$
$\gamma_n^0 + \phi_n^0 + \xi_n^0$
$\gamma_n^0 + 2\phi_n^0$
(b) :
$\gamma_n^0 + 2\xi_n^1 - 1$
$2\phi_n^1 + \xi_n^0 - 1$
$\phi_n^1 + \phi_n^0 + \xi_n^1 - 1$
$2\phi_n^1 + \phi_n^0 - 1$
$\gamma_n^0 + \phi_n^1 + \xi_n^1 - 1$
$\gamma_n^0 + 2\phi_n^1 - 1$
(c) :
$\gamma_n^1 + \phi_n^1 + \eta_n - 1$
$\gamma_n^1 + \phi_n^1 + \xi_n^0 - 1$
$\gamma_n^1 + \phi_n^0 + \xi_n^1 - 1$
$\gamma_n^1 + \phi_n^1 + \phi_n^0 - 1$
$\gamma_n^1 + \xi_n^1 + \xi_n^0 - 1$
(d) :
$\gamma_n^2 + \phi_n^1 + \xi_n^1 - 2$
$\gamma_n^2 + 2\phi_n^1 - 2$
(e) :
$\gamma_n^1 + \phi_n^2 + \xi_n^1 - 2$
$\gamma_n^1 + \phi_n^2 + \phi_n^1 - 2$
$\phi_n^2 + 2\phi_n^1 - 2$
(f) :
$\gamma_n^2 + 2\phi_n^2 - 3$

Figure 17: Illustration of all possible configurations of dominating sets of $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}^2$, which contain those sets with minimum cardinality ξ_{n+1}^0.



Figure 18: Illustration of all possible configurations of dominating sets of $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}^2$, which contain those sets with minimum cardinality ξ_{n+1}^1.



Figure 19: Illustration of all possible configurations of dominating sets of $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}^3$, which contain those sets with minimum cardinality η_{n+1}.

Theorem 3.4. *The domination number of the Sierpiński graph $\mathcal{S}_n$, $n \geq 3$, is $\gamma_n = 3^{n-2}$.*

Proof. According to Lemmas 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3, we obtain $\gamma_{n+1} = \gamma_{n+1}^0 = 3\gamma_n^0 = 3\gamma_n$. Considering $\gamma_3 = 3$, it is obvious that $\gamma_n = 3^{n-2}$ holds for all $n \geq 3$. □

3.3. Number of minimum dominating sets

Let a_n denote the number of minimum dominating sets of the Sierpiński graph $\mathcal{S}_n$, b_n the number of minimum dominating sets of $\mathcal{S}_n^1$ containing no outmost vertices, c_n the number of minimum dominating sets of $\mathcal{S}_n^2$ including no outmost vertices, d_n the number of minimum dominating sets of $\mathcal{S}_n^3$, e_n the number of minimum dominating sets of $\mathcal{S}_n^1$ containing two outmost vertices.

Theorem 3.5. *For $n \geq 3$, the five quantities a_n, b_n, c_n, d_n and e_n can be obtained recursively according to the following relations.*

$$a_{n+1} = 6a_nb_nc_n + 2b_n^3 + 3a_n^2c_n + 9a_nb_n^2 + 6a_n^2b_n + a_n^3, \tag{25}$$

$$\begin{aligned} b_{n+1} = {} & 2a_nc_n^2 + 4b_n^2c_n + 2a_nb_nd_n + a_n^2d_n + 8a_nb_nc_n + \\ & 3b_n^3 + 2a_n^2c_n + 4a_nb_n^2 + a_n^2b_n, \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Table 1: The first several values of a_n, b_n, c_n, d_n and e_n.

n	1	2	3	4	5	6
N_n	3	6	15	42	123	366
a_n	3	6	2	392	1,517,381,906	84,494,691,003,170,101,058,068,575,600
b_n	0	1	3	381	1,435,406,927	79,618,813,236,624,661,173,376,634,785
c_n	0	0	2	356	1,357,582,404	75,023,197,813,382,628,339,656,804,330
d_n	0	0	1	315	1,238,595,209	68,189,726,461,267,338,496,884,215,735
e_n	0	1	1	3	3429	16,877,573,499,350,007

$$c_{n+1} = 2a_nc_nd_n + 4b_nc_n^2 + 2b_n^2d_n + 7b_n^2c_n + 3a_nc_n^2 + 2b_n^3 + 2a_nb_nd_n + 4a_nb_nc_n + a_nb_n^2, \tag{27}$$

$$d_{n+1} = 6b_nc_nd_n + c_n^3 + 9b_nc_n^2 + 3b_n^2d_n + 6b_n^2c_n + b_n^3 + e_n^3, \tag{28}$$

$$e_{n+1} = b_ne_n^2, \tag{29}$$

with the initial condition $a_3 = 2$, $b_3 = 3$, $d_3 = 2$, $d_3 = 1$ *and* $e_3 = 1$.

Proof. We first prove Eq. (25). Note that a_n is actually is the number of different minimum dominating sets for $\mathcal{S}_n$, each of which contains no outmost vertices. Then, according to Lemma 3.3 and Fig. 10, we can establish Eq. (25) by using the rotational symmetry of the Sierpiński graph.

The remaining equations (26)-(29) can be proved similarly. □

Applying Eqs. (25)-(29), the values of a_n, b_n, c_n, d_n and e_n can be recursively obtained for small n as listed in Table 1, which shows that these quantities grow exponentially with n.

4. Comparison and analysis

In the preceding two sections, we studied the minimum dominating set problem for the pseudofracal scale-free web and the Sierpiński graph with identical number of vertices and edges. For both networks, we determined the domination number and the number of minimum dominating sets. From the obtained results, we can see that the domination number of the pseudofracal scale-free web is only half of that corresponding to the Sierpiński graph. However, there exists only one minimum dominating set in pseudofracal scale-free web, while the number of different minimum dominating sets grows fast with the number of vertices. Because the size and number of minimum dominating sets are closely related to network structure, we

argue that this distinction highlights the structural disparity between the pseudofracal scale-free web and the Sierpiński graph.

The above-observed difference of minimum dominating sets between the pseudofracal scale-free web and the Sierpiński graph can be easily understood. The pseudofracal scale-free web is heterogeneous, in which there are high-degree vertices that are connected to each other and are also linked to other small-degree vertices in the network. These high-degree vertices are very efficient in dominating the whole network. Thus, to construct a minimum dominating set, we will try to select high-degree vertices instead of small-degree vertices, which substantially lessens the number of minimum dominating sets. Quite different from the pseudofracal scale-free web, the Sierpiński graph is homogeneous, all its vertices, excluding the three outmost ones, have the same degree of four and thus play a similar role in selecting a minimum dominating set. That's why the number of minimum dominating sets in the Sierpiński graph is much more than that in the pseudofracal scale-free web. Therefore, the difference of minimum dominating sets between the Sierpiński graph and the pseudofracal scale-free web lies in the inhomogeneous topology of the latter.

We note that although we only study the minimum dominating sets in a specific scale-free network, the domination number of which is considerably small taking up about one-sixth of the number of all vertices in the network. Since the scale-free property appears in a large variety of realistic networks, it is expected that the domination number of realistic scale-free networks is also much less, which is qualitatively similar to that of the pseudofracal scale-free web. Recent empirical study reported that in many real scale-free networks, and the domination number is smaller than the network size [6, 7].

5. Conclusions

To conclude, we studied the size and the number of minimum dominating sets in the pseudofracal scale-free web and the Sierpiński graph, which have the same number of vertices and edges. For both networks, by using their self-similarity we determined the explicit expressions for the domination number, which for the former network is only one-half of that for the latter network. We also demonstrated that the minimum dominating set for the pseudofracal scale-free web is unique, while the number of minimum dominating sets in the Sierpiński graph grows exponentially with the number of vertices in the whole graph. The difference of the minimum dominating sets in the two considered networks is rooted in the their architecture disparity: the pseudofracal scale-free web is heterogeneous, while the Sierpiński

graph is homogeneous. Our work provides useful insight into applications of minimum dominating sets in scale-free networks.

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 11275049.

Reference

References

[1] T. W. Haynes, S. Hedetniemi, P. Slater, Fundamentals of Domination in Graphs, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1998.

[2] J. Wu, H. Li, A dominating-set-based routing scheme in ad hoc wireless networks, Telecomm. Syst. 18 (2001) 13–36.

[3] J. Wu, Extended dominating-set-based routing in ad hoc wireless networks with unidirectional links, IEEE Trans. Parallel Distrib. Syst. 13 (2002) 866–881.

[4] C. Shen, T. Li, Multi-document summarization via the minimum dominating set, in: Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Association for Computational Linguistics, pp. 984–992.

[5] S. Wuchty, Controllability in protein interaction networks, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 111 (2014) 7156–7160.

[6] J. C. Nacher, T. Akutsu, Dominating scale-free networks with variable scaling exponent: heterogeneous networks are not difficult to control, New J. Phys. 14 (2012) 073005.

[7] J. C. Nacher, T. Akutsu, Structural controllability of unidirectional bipartite networks, Sci. Rep. 3 (2013) 1647.

[8] Y.-Y. Liu, J.-J. Slotine, A.-L. Barabási, Controllability of complex networks, Nature 473 (2011) 167–173.

[9] T. Nepusz, T. Vicsek, Controlling edge dynamics in complex networks, Nature Phys. 8 (2012) 568–573.

[10] F. V. Fomin, F. Grandoni, A. V. Pyatkin, A. A. Stepanov, Combinatorial bounds via measure and conquer: Bounding minimal dominating sets and applications, ACM Tran. Algorithms 5 (2008) 9.

[11] A.-R. Hedar, R. Ismail, Simulated annealing with stochastic local search for minimum dominating set problem, Int. J. Mach. Learn. Cybernet. 3 (2012) 97–109.

[12] G. D. da Fonseca, C. M. de Figueiredo, V. G. P. de Sá, R. C. Machado, Efficient sub-5 approximations for minimum dominating sets in unit disk graphs, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 540 (2014) 70–81.

[13] M. Gast, M. Hauptmann, M. Karpinski, Inapproximability of dominating set on power law graphs, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 562 (2015) 436–452.

[14] J.-F. Couturier, R. Letourneur, M. Liedloff, On the number of minimal dominating sets on some graph classes, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 562 (2015) 634–642.

[15] L. R. Matheson, R. E. Tarjan, Dominating sets in planar graphs, Europ. J. Combinatorics 17 (1996) 565–568.

[16] M. M. Kanté, V. Limouzy, A. Mary, L. Nourine, On the enumeration of minimal dominating sets and related notions, SIAM J. Discrete Math. 28 (2014) 1916–1929.

[17] T. Honjo, K.-i. Kawarabayashi, A. Nakamoto, Dominating sets in triangulations on surfaces, J. Graph Theory 63 (2010) 17–30.

[18] J.-H. Zhao, Y. Habibulla, H.-J. Zhou, Statistical mechanics of the minimum dominating set problem, J. Stat. Phys. 159 (2015) 1154–1174.

[19] Z. Li, E. Zhu, Z. Shao, J. Xu, On dominating sets of maximal outerplanar and planar graphs, Discrete Appl. Math. 198 (2016) 164–169.

[20] P. A. Golovach, P. Heggernes, D. Kratsch, Enumerating minimal connected dominating sets in graphs of bounded chordality, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 630 (2016) 63–75.

[21] M. E. J. Newman, The structure and function of complex networks, SIAM Rev. 45 (2003) 167–256.

[22] A. Barabási, R. Albert, Emergence of scaling in random networks, Science 286 (1999) 509–512.

[23] F. Molnár Jr, N. Derzsy, É. Czabarka, L. Székely, B. K. Szymanski, G. Korniss, Dominating scale-free networks using generalized probabilistic methods, Sci. Rep. 4 (2014) 6308.

[24] L. Lovász, M. D. Plummer, Matching Theory, volume 29 of *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, North Holland, New York, 1986.

[25] S. N. Dorogovtsev, A. V. Goltsev, J. F. F. Mendes, Pseudofractal scale-free web, Phys. Rev. E 65 (2002) 066122.

[26] Z. Z. Zhang, Y. Qi, S. G. Zhou, W. L. Xie, J. H. Guan, Exact solution for mean first-passage time on a pseudofractal scale-free web, Phys. Rev. E 79 (2009) 021127.

[27] Z. Z. Zhang, S. G. Zhou, L. C. Chen, Evolving pseudofractal networks, Eur. Phys. J. B 58 (2007) 337–344.

[28] C. Song, S. Havlin, H. Makse, Self-similarity of complex networks, Nature 433 (2005) 392–395.

[29] Z. Z. Zhang, H. X. Liu, B. Wu, S. G. Zhou, Enumeration of spanning trees in a pseudofractal scale-free web, Europhys. Lett. 90 (2010) 68002.